

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. By this amendment, Claim 14 has been amended to comply with 35 U.S.C. §101, and claims 5, 9, 11 and 12 have been amended to overcome the rejection under §112.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Case.

While the Office Action specifically points to Figures 4-13 of Case, and appears to assert that the feature value data corresponds to the ECG recorder 32 of Case, the Office Action fails to address where in the reference it is taught that the chart data is to be used to display a chart that relates the feature value to each portion of the heart as recited in, for example, independent claim 1.

Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, Case does not display ECG information, where the ECG information is related to each portion of the heart. In contrast, in Case, a display is provided that has 30° angular separation between adjacent electrode pair potential difference electrocardiograph sample voltages. (See, for example, Fig. 18 of Case). There is absolutely no teaching, suggestion or disclosure in Case of the chart data being used to display a chart that relates the feature value to each portion of the heart as claimed.

Regarding Claim 9, the Office Action points to Fig. 18 of Case for this teaching. However, as is apparent at least from the Summary of the Invention of Case, the various charts displayed in Fig. 18 correspond to *electrode pairs that are placed on various parts of the body* – not where the chart data is to be used to display a chart that relates the feature value to each portion of the heart including at least left portion of the heart, right portion of the heart, bottom portion of the heart, front portion of the heart, or inner portion of the heart.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of col. 5, lines 43-58 and Fig. 11 of Matsumura. However, applicants respectfully submit there is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure in Matsumura of the chart data being used to display a chart that relates the feature value to each portion of the heart as claimed.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Case in view of Hamilton, Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Case in view of Patnoi, Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as unpatentable over Case in view

of Baba and Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Case in view of Dubin.

All of these references fail to teach, suggest or disclose the chart data being used to display a chart that relates the feature value to each portion of the heart as claimed.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited references and are in condition for allowance – such disposition is thus respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

Date: 17 Jan 08

By: 

Jason H. Vick  
Reg. No. 45,285  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: 303-863-9700